



NOMINATION OF JUDGE SONIA SOTOMAYOR AS ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

RELEASED ON JULY 13, 2009

Prepared by Nydia Menendez, President

nydia@menendezlawfirm.com; (954) 96307220

www.prbarflorida.org

THE FACTS ABOUT JUDGE SONIA SOTOMAYOR

Introduction: Earlier this year, Justice David H. Souter's intention to retire was announced. In response, President Obama promised to nominate someone with a sharp and independent mind, a record of excellence and integrity, who rejects ideology and shares his deep respect for the Constitution, and who has a common sense understanding of how laws affect the daily realities of people's lives.

On Tuesday, May 26, 2009, President Obama announced his nominee of choice was Circuit Court Judge Sonia Sotomayor. President Obama is the first sitting president to nominate a Latino to serve on the High Court. If confirmed Judge Sotomayor will be the third female and the third person of color to serve on the Supreme Court.

The Facts About President Obama's Nominee – Judge Sonia Sotomayor: Judge Sotomayor is an excellent selection for the Supreme Court. She embraces the personal qualities, academic excellence, legal experience, extraordinarily high level of professional competence, integrity and judicial temperament that are essential in a Justice. Her professionalism and experience has earned her the nomination as well as the endorsement of many bar associations including the American Bar Association (ABA), the Hispanic National Bar Association (HNBA), the Coalition of Hispanic Bars of Florida (CHBAF), and the Puerto Rican Bar Association of Florida (PR Bar) - to name just a few.

First, her personal experience reveals strength of character, integrity, diligence, tenacity, determination, ambition and discipline. Judge Sotomayor is the epitome of the American dream. She was born to a Puerto Rican family and grew up in a public housing project in the South Bronx. At the age of eight (8) Judge Sotomayor was diagnosed with diabetes. Her father was a factory worker with a third-grade education, and died when Sotomayor was nine years old. Her mother raised Sotomayor while working as a nurse. She was raised by her single mother.

From early on she kept her focus on education, and she was always mindful of giving back to her community through public service work (discussed below). Clearly, her personal story is compelling!

Second, Judge Sotomayor's academic credentials are stellar and solid. She graduated as valedictorian of her class at Blessed Sacrament and at Cardinal Spellman High School in New York. She won a scholarship and attended Princeton University on a scholarship where she continued to excel, graduating *summa cum laude*, and Phi Beta Kappa. At Princeton she was a co-recipient of the M. Taylor Pyne Prize, the highest honor Princeton awards to an undergraduate.

Sotomayor then went on to Yale Law School. There she served as an editor of the Yale Law Journal and as managing editor of the Yale Studies in World Public Order. In law school Sotomayor reached a breaking point over her heritage. Lawyers for a well-known Washington law firm made what she viewed as insulting remarks at a recruiting dinner, suggesting that Sotomayor was at Yale only because of

affirmative action. Instead of shrugging it off, Sotomayor filed a formal complaint. Student groups quickly backed her and demanded that the firm be barred from recruiting on campus. A faculty-student tribunal was convened to hear testimony. Two of the three faculty members, all white men, sided with the law firm against her. The tribunal as a whole, however, ruled in her favor, and the law firm was forced to apologize. Still, Sotomayor declined to return for another interview.

Third, Judge Sotomayor's legal career and experience is outstanding, both as an attorney and as a judge.

After earning her law degree, Sotomayor would spend five years as Assistant District Attorney in Manhattan, (acknowledged by many as one of the best District/County Attorney's office in the country) trying dozens of criminal cases. There she earned a reputation as a "fearless and effective prosecutor" working street crimes including murder, child abuse, police misconduct and fraud cases. Robert Morgenthau, the District Attorney under which Sotomayor served, advises that those who call her "soft on crime" should speak to the inmates that are serving their sentences to this day.

In 1984, she joined the law firm of Pavia and Harcourt, where she specialized as an international corporate litigator handling matters involving intellectual property, banking, real estate, corporate and contract law. Distinguishing herself as a bright and skilled lawyer, she became a partner in approximately 3 ½ years, and remained at her firm until she was appointed by the first President Bush to the District Court bench in 1992. She was later nominated to the Court of Appeals in 1997 by President Clinton; and was confirmed in 1998. She received bipartisan support for both appointments.

Judge Sotomayor became the first Latina to serve on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, one of the most demanding circuits in the country. She has been a federal judge for 17 years, serving with distinction in the Southern District of New York for six years and the Second Circuit Court of Appeals for 11 years. As a federal trial judge, she has earned a reputation as a defender of the Rule of Law and for not being susceptible to outside pressures. She decided over 450 cases as a trial judge and on the Court of Appeals she has participated in over 3,000 panel decisions and authored approximately 400 published opinions and hundreds more unpublished opinions. Both courts have heavy caseloads and the Circuit Court often addresses issues of first impression, involving complex constitutional, statutory and regulatory matters. Judge Sotomayor has also taught at New York University School of Law and Columbia University School of Law.

During her tenure on the Circuit Court, Judge Sotomayor has handled a varied docket. A review of her decisions indicates that she is a judicial moderate. She is a strong proponent of judicial restraint and avoids opining on matters not before the Court or matters unrelated or unnecessary to the Court's legal analysis. Her decisions are well-written and detailed, grounded in specific facts of the case, with strict adherence to precedence, and narrow application of the law. Her opinions are clear and concise, and reveal a pragmatic approach to her decision-making and a strong commitment to judicial deference to legislative mandates, as well as a fair approach to the balancing of government and private interests.

Her decisions illustrate her concern with the application of her decisions to the parties and the lower courts, as well as the importance and limits of judicial review and deference to the administrative agencies. Careful analysis by scholars and practicing attorneys in specialty areas concluded that her decisions do not reveal any bias or preference for any party or pre-disposition for any ideology.

Almost all of her career has been in public service – as a prosecutor, trial judge, and now appellate judge. Judge Sotomayor has earned an exemplary and distinguished record in all levels and phases of our legal system - law student, prosecutor, private practitioner, and as a federal district court and appellate judge. Thirty years after graduating from law school Sotomayor she is poised to go to Washington if the U.S. Senate confirms her, making her the first Latina on the Supreme Court.

If confirmed, Judge Sotomayor would be the only sitting justice with trial judge experience, and would fill a vacuum otherwise left by the retirement of Justice Souter, who was also a trial judge.

Judge Sotomayor is widely admired as a judge with a sophisticated grasp of legal doctrine and a keen awareness of the law's impact on everyday life. The White House points out that she often forged consensus with her fellow republican appointees on three-judge panels, agreeing with them more than 95% of the time. The White House also notes that Judge Sotomayor has more federal judicial experience than any Supreme Court Justice in the past 100 years and more judicial experience than anyone confirmed for the Supreme Court in the past 70 years. Also, she would bring broad and deep legal experience to the Supreme Court, having served as a prosecutor, litigator, trial court and appellate judge. No current justice on the Supreme Court has that breadth of experience.

Judge Sotomayor is the recipient of many awards and honors, including the Gertrude E. Rush Award from the National Bar Association, the 2009 New York State Woman of Excellence Award presented by New York's Governor Paterson, Honorary Degree of Doctor of Laws from Northeastern University School of Law, Degree of Doctor of Laws Honoris Causa from Pace Law School, Degree of Doctor of Laws Honoris Causa from Princeton University, Arabella Babb Mansfield Award from the National Association of Women Lawyers, Distinguished Lawyers Award from the Lawyers College of Puerto Rico, the HNBA's Latina of the Year Award and the HNBA's Award for Commitment to the Preservation of Civil and Constitutional Rights for All Americans, Emilio Nunez Award for Judicial Service from the Puerto Rican Bar Association, and various awards from numerous law student, including Latino Law Student, organizations.

Clearly, Judge Sotomayor is exceptionally well prepared to serve on the Supreme Court.

Additional Comments and Clarification About Sotomayor:

- Sotomayor on abortion: Sotomayor's sole opinion regarding abortion was in line with the anti-abortion movement's position. Despite 17 years on the bench, Judge Sotomayor has never directly decided whether a law regulating abortion was constitutional. Sotomayor participated in a decision concerning the Mexico City Policy, which President Obama recently overturned and which prohibits sending taxpayer dollars to groups that promote and perform abortions in other nations.

Writing for the Second Circuit, Judge Sotomayor upheld the Mexico City Policy, but Americans United for Life (AUL, a pro-life group) says the significance of the decision "may be minimal because the issue was largely controlled by the Second Circuit's earlier opinion in a similar challenge to the policy." AUL notes that Judge Sotomayor also upheld the pro-life policy by rejecting claims from a pro-abortion legal group that it violated the Equal Protection Clause. That said, pro-choice groups hailed her nomination, with Planned Parenthood declaring that she "understands the importance of ensuring that our Supreme Court justices respect precedent while also protecting our civil liberties."

- Sotomayor has been referred to as the *Savior of Baseball*: Word has it that in 1995 Judge Sotomayor became revered, at least in those cities with major league baseball teams, when she ended a long baseball strike that year, briskly ruling against the owners in favor of the players. Judge Sotomayor ruled that the owners were trying to subvert the labor system, and the strike had placed the entire concept of collective bargaining on trial. For baseball players and fans, it is reported that Sotomayor joined forever the ranks of Joe DiMaggio, Willie Mays, Jackie Robinson and Ted Williams. The Chicago Sun-Times said she "delivered a wicked fastball" to baseball owners and emerged as one of the most inspiring figures in the history of the sport.

- Judge Sotomayor is NOT an activist. Contrary to the charges that Judge Sotomayor is an “activist” judge, a careful analysis of her decisions in the areas of antitrust, civil rights, criminal law and sentencing, Fourth Amendment, employment discrimination, immigration, voting rights, language rights, gender-related issues and international law – by scholars and practicing attorneys – reveals that her decisions are well written, grounded in the specific facts of the case and void of any bias for the parties or pre-disposition based on ideology.
- Her comments in a 2005 statement, describing the role that appellate justices have in forming policy, which they claim is akin to an endorsement of “judicial activism.” The words spoken by Sotomayor were exactly as follows:

"All of the legal defense funds out there, they are looking for people with court of appeals experience because the court of appeals is where policy is made," she said, laughing a bit through the next part: "And I know this is on tape and I should never say that because we don't make law. I know. Okay, I know. I'm not promoting it. I'm not advocating it. I know."

However, legal scholars have noted, Sotomayor's statement is entirely factual: "She's not wrong," said Jeffrey Segal, a professor of law at Stony Brook University. "Of course they make policy... You can, on one hand, say Congress makes the law and the court interprets it. But on the other hand the law is not always clear. And in clarifying those laws, the courts make policy." Eric Freedman, a law professor at Hofstra University, was equally dismissive of this emerging conservative talking point. "She was saying something which is the absolute judicial equivalent of saying the sun rises each morning. It is not a controversial proposition at all that the overwhelming quantity of law making work in the federal system is done by the court of appeals... It is thoroughly uncontroversial to anyone other than a determined demagogue."

Indeed, during her 1998 confirmation hearing, Sotomayor spoke of her judicial philosophy, saying "I don't believe we should bend the Constitution under any circumstance. It says what it says. We should do honor to it."

To further support the fact that she is not an activist or otherwise an extremist, we note that she currently sits on the bench through bipartisan effort. She was appointed to the Federal District Court, Southern District of New York by President George H. W. Bush, and nominated to the Second Circuit Court by President Clinton in 1999, and confirmed 1998 with bipartisan support in a 67-29 vote. All Democrats voted in favor of Sotomayor (although three did not vote), while Republicans opposed her by a 29-25 majority. Among those Senators who are still in the chamber today, however, Sotomayor's margin of confirmation was a bit more comfortable: 35-11.

Indeed, five current Republican Senators voted in favor of her nomination then: Sens. Collins, Gregg, Hatch, Lugar, Snowe. Among the no votes were current Minority Leader Mitch McConnell, current Minority Whip John Kyl and Sen. Jeff Sessions, currently the ranking Republican on the Judiciary Committee.

- Clarification on the recent firefighter case in which Judge Sotomayor's ruling was overturned by the US Supreme Court. The fact is that Sotomayor followed then-existing law when she decided the *Ricci* firefighters case. The Supreme Court's 5-4 decision reversing her created a new law. In *Bushey v. New York State Civil Service Commission*, a case which is factually almost identical to the Ricci firefighters case, Judge Sotomayor's court held that employers have sweeping authority to reconsider a promotion test when minorities underperform white applicants. This broad authority was reaffirmed just 10 years ago in *Hayden v. County of Nassau*.² As a lower court judge, Sotomayor is required to

follow these binding precedents until they are overruled by a higher authority, despite conservative claims that she should have ignored the law governing the *Ricci* case.

- Does Sotomayor sit on the Board of and extremist organization? Clearly not! Sotomayor's sits on the Board of the Puerto Rican Legal Defense and Education Fund ("PRLDEF") a highly regarded civil rights not for profit organization. Senator Jeff Sessions (R-AL), however, characterized PRLDEF as an "extreme" organization. In response New York Mayor Michael Bloomberg, said that "[o]nly in Washington could someone's many years of volunteer service to a highly regarded nonprofit organization that has done so much good for so many be twisted into a negative."

We note that in 1986, Jeff Sessions' nomination to the federal bench was rejected by the Senate, in part because of Sessions' claims that the NAACP is a "Communist-inspired" and "un-American" organization." Twenty-three years later, civil rights organizations such as the NAACP and PRLDEF are still well within the mainstream of American society, but Jefferson Beauregard Sessions III has not changed one bit."

- Let's clear up the "confusion" about Sotomayor's "wise latina women" statement. The exact statement was: "I would hope that a wise Latina woman with the richness of her experiences would more often than not reach a better conclusion than a white male who hasn't lived that life."

That statement was made by Judge Sotomayor's when she delivered a speech at a UC Berkeley School of Law symposium titled "Raising the Bar: Latino and Latina Presence in the Judiciary and the Struggle for Representation." this talk on Oct. 26, 2001, as the Judge Mario G. Olmos Memorial Lecture. She spoke. She introduced her presentation as follows: "I intend tonight to touch upon the themes that this conference will be discussing this weekend and to talk to you about my Latina identity, where it came from, and the influence I perceive it has on my presence on the bench." Later in the presentation, Judge Sotomayor describes a conversation she had with another judge about the fact that seminal decisions in race and sex discrimination cases have come from Supreme Courts composed exclusively of white males. Judge Sotomayor clarifies that while she agrees that this is significant, it is more compelling that "the people who argued those cases before the Supreme Court which changed the legal landscape ultimately were largely people of color and women. I recall that Justice Thurgood Marshall, Judge Connie Baker Motley, the first black woman appointed to the federal bench, and others of the NAACP argued *Brown v. Board of Education*. Similarly, Justice Ginsburg, with other women attorneys, was instrumental in advocating and convincing the Court that equality of work required equality in terms and conditions of employment.

"Whether born from experience or inherent physiological or cultural differences, ... our gender and national origins may and will make a difference in our judging. Justice O'Connor has often been cited as saying that a wise old man and wise old woman will reach the same conclusion in deciding cases. I am not so sure Justice O'Connor is the author of that line since Professor Resnik attributes that line to Supreme Court Justice Coyle. I am also not so sure that I agree with the statement. First, as Professor Martha Minnow has noted, there can never be a universal definition of wise. Second, I would hope that a wise Latina woman with the richness of her experiences would more often than not reach a better conclusion than a white male who hasn't lived that life. (Empahsis added.)

"Let us not forget that wise men like Oliver Wendell Holmes and Justice Cardozo voted on cases which upheld both sex and race discrimination in our society. Until 1972, no Supreme Court case ever upheld the claim of a woman in a gender discrimination case. I, like Professor Carter, believe that we should not be so myopic as to believe that others of different experiences or backgrounds are incapable of understanding the values and needs of people from a different group. Many are so capable. As Judge Cedarbaum pointed out to me, nine white men on the Supreme Court in the past have done so on many occasions and on many issues including *Brown*.

“However, to understand takes time and effort, something that not all people are willing to give. For others, their experiences limit their ability to understand the experiences of others. Other simply do not care. Hence, one must accept the proposition that a difference there will be by the presence of women and people of color on the bench. Personal experiences affect the facts that judges choose to see. My hope is that I will take the good from my experiences and extrapolate them further into areas with which I am unfamiliar. I simply do not know exactly what that difference will be in my judging. But I accept there will be some based on my gender and my Latina heritage.

“I also hope that by raising the question today of what difference having more Latinos and Latinas on the bench will make will start your own evaluation. For people of color and women lawyers, what does and should being an ethnic minority mean in your lawyering? For men lawyers, what areas in your experiences and attitudes do you need to work on to make you capable of reaching those great moments of enlightenment which other men in different circumstances have been able to reach. For all of us, how do change the facts that in every task force study of gender and race bias in the courts, women and people of color, lawyers and judges alike, report in significantly higher percentages than white men that their gender and race has shaped their careers, from hiring, retention to promotion and that a statistically significant number of women and minority lawyers and judges, both alike, have experienced bias in the courtroom?

“Each day on the bench I learn something new about the judicial process and about being a professional Latina woman in a world that sometimes looks at me with suspicion. I am reminded each day that I render decisions that affect people concretely and that I owe them constant and complete vigilance in checking my assumptions, presumptions and perspectives and ensuring that to the extent that my limited abilities and capabilities permit me, that I reevaluate them and change as circumstances and cases before me requires. I can and do aspire to be greater than the sum total of my experiences but I accept my limitations. I willingly accept that we who judge must not deny the differences resulting from experience and heritage but attempt, as the Supreme Court suggests, continuously to judge when those opinions, sympathies and prejudices are appropriate.”

Now armed with the context of the statement, a better determination about whether the comment was out of line can be made. Justice Ginsburg explains it as follows: “There are some people in Congress who would criticize severely anyone President Obama nominated. They’ll seize on any handle. One is that she’s a woman, another is that she made the remark about Latina women. And I thought it was ridiculous for them to make a big deal out of that. Think of how many times you’ve said something that you didn’t get out quite right, and you would edit your statement if you could. I’m sure she meant no more than what I mean when I say: Yes, women bring a different life experience to the table. All of our differences make the conference better. That I’m a woman, that’s part of it, that I’m Jewish, that’s part of it, that I grew up in Brooklyn, N.Y., and I went to summer camp in the Adirondacks, all these things are part of me.”

Myriam Irizarry, a Director of the PR Bar, explains: “I believe she meant that given her cultural background and upbringing, she is better postured to understand those differences when people of different cultures appear before her. That is not to say that an anglo judge could not make a better decision, but it is to say that judges need to be representative of the make-up of our communities so that people appearing before our courts see a face that they can identify with. While their treatment will be equal to all others coming before the court, she as a Hispanic judge can empathize and understand the circumstances that bring these particular folks before our courts. The insight she has gained from growing up poor and in an urban environment where she saw first-hand the plight and the culture of particularly poor minority people is something that the counterpart anglo judge could not bring to bear unless they too were raised in that environment. Taking these factors into consideration would give her a picture of the totality of the circumstances upon which she must rule.

Every judge brings their experiences to the bench and use that knowledge to help shape their decisions. That is what makes our judiciary unique and why it is so important to have these different experiences represented on the bench so that decisions could be made with a broader understanding of the litigants and defendants that come before our courts which ultimately results in better decisions.”

Frank Rullan, another PR Bar Director, further notes: “Assuming two judges are of equal intelligence, which is a better judge? A judge that has been raised and lived all his life in a castle and has never gone out, and only knows the poor people from reading books and watching TV news; or a judge that was raised among real people and has seen them with her own eyes struggling to survive in this Nation? I think main contribution from Sotomayor to the bench is not that she is Hispanic (which is also a great contribution) but that she knows what is to be poor in this country and what it takes to succeed in this country when you come from a disadvantage background. All the other Judges in the Supreme Court are millionaires who hardly had to struggle or make sacrifices in life to succeed.

Finally, Diana Sen, currently with Latino Justice/PRLDEF, comments: “Maybe the fact that people have to resort to her out of court statements (offered for the truth of the matter asserted - sounds like hearsay), instead of looking to her opinions is proof that she is a stellar judge who should be swiftly confirmed.”

The PR Bar’s Position Regarding Sotomayor As A Supreme Court Justice

- The PR Bar believes she is a role model for all Americans, in particular for Hispanic Americans and other people of color. She exemplifies the best within the national legal community.
- Judge Sotomayor has distinguished herself for her integrity, objectivity, and high respect in the legal community. Her brilliant legal career has been tempered with a common sense of how the law works in the lives of everyday Americans.
- The endorsement of Judge Sotomayor by the leading national bar associations is probative of the fact that both, as a lawyer and as a judge, she has distinguished herself by her commitment to excellence.
- It is estimated that by 2010, in just a few months, Hispanics will be the largest minority group in the United States. The landscape of America is changing; our courts, including the High Court, must reflect the People over which its rulings apply.
- Through this nomination President Obama has taken note of the intellectual wealth and skills that exist within the Hispanic legal community. Yet, there are only 82 Latino(a) Judges on the federal bench and on state courts of last resort. It is clear that the Bench in its current state does not reflect the People of this great nation. This is the first time that any U.S. President has nominated a Hispanic American to the Supreme Court of the United States. The PR Bar believes this is a step in the right direction.
- A diverse U.S. Supreme Court is important to maintaining and instilling trust and confidence in the legitimacy of the U.S. legal and justice systems. Greater diversity on the Supreme Court will strengthen our jurisprudence by broadening the perspectives considered by the justices as they debate matters before the High Court, and thus enhance the administration of justice for all Americans.

A review of the facts about Judge Sotomayor, clearly indicates that she is well qualified to serve on the High Court. For said reasons the PR Bar has taken the unprecedented step of endorsing the nomination of a judicial candidate. In doing so, we believe we need to make it clear that our support of Judge Sotomayor is not based solely on her Puerto Rican background. Instead, our support of Judge Sotomayor is strictly

rooted on her qualifications, both personal and professional, which adhere to the guidelines for judicial appointments established by the ABA and adopted by the HNBA.

What You Can And Should Do to Ensure Judge Sotomayor Is Confirmed:

In preparation for Judge Sotomayor's pending confirmation hearing before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, set to begin on Monday, July 13, 2009, if you are convinced that Judge Sotomayor is qualified to serve on the Supreme Court, and if you want to see her nomination confirmed, the PR Bar urges you to voice your support. Here are a few ideas!

- Write, call, e-mail! See the list of target names and contact information. These include:
 - Governor Charlie Crist, Office of Governor Charlie Crist, State of Florida, The Capitol, 400 S. Monroe Street, Tallahassee, FL 32399-0001
 - Member of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary – See page 9.
 - Members of Congress, especially your state Senators (Nelson and Martinez) and your state Representatives – See page 10.
- Assemble and file petitions – electronically or the good old fashion way, by using the US Postal Service!
- Go to <http://www.justiceforjusticesotomayor.org/> for more ideas.
- Ask your family and friends to do the same.

About the Puerto Rican Bar Association of Florida

Since its creation in 2003, the Puerto Rican Bar Association of Florida ("PR Bar") has served as a voice for the concerns and opinions of the close to 1 million persons of Puerto Rican heritage living in the State of Florida. Linked by culture, heritage and common interest in issues affecting the Puerto Rican community, the association was created to promote the advancement of Puerto Ricans in the legal profession and further integrate the Puerto Rican community in the professional and civic fabric of Florida.

Among PR Bar many objectives is the desire to increase awareness and promote a stronger commitment to the civil and political rights and responsibilities of Puerto Ricans as U.S. citizens and residents of Florida. The PR Bar plans to achieve this, in part, by partnering with other organizations to educate our community about the voting process and the need for full participation.

The PR Bar embraces members from all over Florida and is committed to forge ahead and make the association a long and lasting endeavor, poised to serve as an instrument of change, unity and excellence for a long time to come.

The PR Bar is a 501(c)(6) non profit professional organization. For additional information about her PRBar or the seminar you can contact Nydia Menéndez at (954) 963-7220 or nydia@menendezlawfirm.com.

UNITED STATES SENATE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

MEMBERS AND THEIR CONTACT INFORMATION

Visit <http://judiciary.senate.gov/about/members.cfm> for more information about each member.

Senator Patrick J. Leahy (Chair)
433 Russell Senate Office Building, Washington, DC 20510
(202) 224-4244 (O); E-mail: senator leahy@leahy.senate.gov

Senator Charles E. Schumer
313 Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, DC 20510
(202) 224-6542 (O); (202) 228-3027 (F)

Senator Orrin G. Hatch
104 Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, DC 20510
(202) 224-5251 (O); (202) 224-6331 (F)

Senator Jeff Sessions
335 Russell Senate Office Building, Washington, DC 20510-0104
(202) 224-4124 (O); (202) 224-3149 (F)

Senator Jon Kyl
730 Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, DC 20510
(202) 224-4521 (O); (202) 224-2207 (F)

Senator Lindsey Graham
290 Russell Senate Office Building, Washington, DC 20510
(202) 224-5972 (O)

Senator John Cornyn
517 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510
(202) 224-2934 (O); (202) 228-2856 (F)

Senator Tom Coburn
172 Russell Senate Office Building, Washington, DC 20510
(202) 224-5754 (O); (202) 224-6008 (F)

Senator Amy Klobuchar
302 Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, DC 20510
(202) 224-3244 (O); (202) 228-2186 (F)

Senator Arlen Specter
711 Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, DC 20510-1501
(202) 224-4254 (O); (202) 228-1229 (F)

Senator Charles E. Grassley
135 Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, DC 20510-1501
(202) 224-3744 (O); (202) 224-6020 (F)

Senator Russell D. Feingold
506 Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, DC 20510-4904
(202) 224-5323(O); (202) 224-2725 (F)

Senator Diane Feinstein
331 Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, DC 20510
(202) 224-3841 (O); (202) 228-3954 (F)

Senator Herb Kohl
330 Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, DC 20510-1501
(202) 224-5653 (O); (202) 224-9787 (F)

Senator Richard J. Durbin
309 Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, DC 20510
(202) 224-2152 (O); (202) 228-0400 (F)

Senator Benjamin L. Cardin
509 Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, DC 20510
(202) 224-4524 (O)

Senator Sheldon Whitehouse
502 Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, DC 20510
(202) 224-2921 (O); (202) 228-6362 (F)

Senator Ron Wyden
223 Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC 20510- 3703
(202) 224-5244 (O); (202) 228-2717 (F)

Senator Edward E. Kaufman
383 Russell Senate Office Building, Washington, DC 20510
(202) 224-5042 (O); (202) 228-3075 (F)

CONTACT INFORMATION FOR SENATOR AND STATE REPRESENTATIVES FOR FLORIDA

Got to <http://www.visi.com/juan/congress/>. There you will find all the states. By clicking on any one state you can learn how many senators and representatives your state has. Florida for example, has two senators (Senator Bill Nelson (D) and Senator Mel Martinez (R)). Below is their contact information as well as the names and contact information for all Florida state representatives.

Residents of Florida are represented in Congress by 2 Senators and 25 Representatives.

Member Name	DC Phone	DC FAX	Electronic Correspondence
Senator Bill Nelson (D - FL)	202-224-5274	202-228-2183	http://billnelson.senate.gov/contact/email.cfm
Senator Mel Martinez (R - FL)	202-224-3041	202-228-5171	http://martinez.senate.gov/public/?p=EmailSenatorMartinez
Representative Jeff Miller (R - 01)	202-225-4136	202-225-3414	http://jeffmiller.house.gov/index.cfm?FuseAction=Contact.Home
Representative Allen Boyd (D - 02)	202-225-5235	202-225-5615	http://www.house.gov/boyd/zip_authen.html
Representative Corrine Brown (D - 03)	202-225-0123	202-225-2256	http://www.house.gov/corrinebrown/IMA/issue.shtml
Representative Ander Crenshaw (R - 04)	202-225-2501	202-225-2504	http://www.house.gov/writerep/
Representative Ginny Brown-Waite (R - 05)	202-225-1002	202-226-6559	http://www.house.gov/formbrown-waite/IMA/issue_subscribe.htm
Representative Cliff Stearns (R - 06)	202-225-5744	202-225-3973	http://www.house.gov/writerep/
Representative John L. Mica (R - 07)	202-225-4035	202-226-0821	http://www.house.gov/mica/messageform.shtml
Representative Alan Grayson (D - 08)	202-225-2176	202-225-0999	https://forms.house.gov/grayson/contact-form.shtml
Representative Gus Bilirakis (R - 09)	202-225-5755	202-225-4085	http://www.house.gov/formbilirakis/issue_subscribe.htm
Representative C. W. (Bill) Young (R - 10)	202-225-5961	202-225-9764	Bill.Young@mail.house.gov
Representative Kathy Anne Castor (D - 11)	202-225-3376	202-225-5652	http://www.house.gov/writerep/
Representative Adam Putnam (R - 12)	202-225-1252	202-226-0585	http://adamputnam.house.gov/contact.shtml
Representative Vern Buchanan (R - 13)	202-225-5015	202-226-0828	http://buchanan.house.gov/contact.shtml
Representative Connie Mack (R - 14)	202-225-2536	202-226-0439	https://mack.house.gov/?p=Email
Representative Bill Posey (R - 15)	202-225-3671	202-225-3516	http://posey.house.gov/Contact/
Representative Tom Rooney (R - 16)	202-225-5792	202-225-3132	https://forms.house.gov/rooney/contact-form.shtml
Representative Kendrick B. Meek (D - 17)	202-225-4506	202-226-0777	http://kendrickmeek.house.gov/contact1.shtml
Representative Ileana Ros-Lehtinen (R - 18)	202-225-3931	202-225-5620	http://www.house.gov/writerep/
Representative Robert Wexler (D - 19)	202-225-3001	202-225-5974	http://www.wexler.house.gov/email.shtml
Representative Debbie Wasserman Schultz (D - 20)	202-225-7931	202-226-2052	http://wassermanschultz.house.gov/zipauth.htm
Representative Lincoln Diaz-Balart (R - 21)	202-225-4211	202-225-8576	http://diaz-balart.house.gov/index.cfm?FuseAction=Offices.Contact
Representative Ron Klein (D - 22)	202-225-3026	202-225-8398	http://klein.house.gov/?sectionid=4&iointree=4
Representative Alcee L. Hastings (D - 23)	202-225-1313	202-225-1171	https://forms.house.gov/alceehastings/webforms/issue_subscribe.htm
Representative Suzanne Kosmas (D - 24)	202-225-2706	202-226-6299	https://forms.house.gov/kosmas/contact-form.shtml
Representative Mario Diaz-Balart (R - 25)	202-225-2778	202-226-0346	http://www.house.gov/formmariodiaz-balart/ic_zip_auth.htm

Bill Nelson's Comments On Sotomayor's Nomination - The president has picked someone with extensive judicial experience for the Supreme Court. I'm told she brings an open mind to each case she hears and decides them on the merits. I look forward to a more detailed review of her record during the confirmation process. <http://billnelson.senate.gov/news/hottopics.cfm>

Martinez On The Record Regarding Nomination of Judge Sotomayor - "I think she's a very, very bright person, very, very much someone who the Supreme Court will find will fit in very well," said Martinez, a Republican from Orlando.

He said he will withhold judgment about whether she deserves a lifetime appointment to the court until her Senate confirmation hearings this summer, "but I should say I am very, very impressed with her, not only her personal qualities, but her understanding of the role of the judiciary, and the role of a judge." <http://www.tampabay.com/news/politics/national/article1008615.ece>